

REMARKS

In the application claims 1-27 remain pending. No claims have been withdrawn and no claims have been added. The claims as amended find their support in the specification and figures as originally filed and no new matter has been added. In this regard, the claims have been amended only to make more clear the subject matter that applicants originally intended to claim and, as such, the amendments should not be considered to otherwise limit the scope of the invention claimed.

The pending claims presently stand rejected. The reconsideration of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, originally filed claims 1, 3, 5-6, 11, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being rendered obvious by Amro (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,762), originally filed claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being rendered obvious by Amro as modified by Kolawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,974), originally filed claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being rendered obvious by Amro as modified by Morris (U.S. Patent No. 6,353,848), originally filed claims 7-8, 10, 13-14, 16-17, 19-25, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being rendered obvious by Huang (U.S. Patent No. 6,437,836) as modified by Amro, originally filed claims 9, 15, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Huang as modified by Amro and Ketcham (U.S. Patent No. 6,195,589), and originally filed claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being rendered obvious by Huang as modified by Amro and Kolawa. In rejecting originally filed claims 1-6, 11, and 12, the Office Action asserted that the claims were rendered obvious by the disclosure in Amro of an appliance having a memory having stored therein an electronic document (item 290) and a hand-held device adapted to communicate with the appliance to retrieve and display a representation of the

electronic document (items 170, 356, 358, 430, and 440). In rejecting originally filed claims 7-10 and 13-27, the Office Action asserted that these claims were rendered obvious by the disclosure in Huang of a method for accessing a Web server to download a document (an electronic program guide) as modified by the disclosure in Amro directed to a hand-held device having a display in which is presented a representation of an electronic interface for an appliance.

In response, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references fail to render the now pending claims obvious. Specifically, it is submitted that the art of record cannot be said to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element that is now recited in the claims as is required to maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is further submitted that the art of record also fails to provide any motivation to combine elements in a manner that could be said to render the claims obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In this regard, it is noted that, when combining elements, it is impermissible to pick and choose from a reference only so much as will support a given position while disregarding what a reference fairly teaches in its entirety. It is also impermissible to use the disclosure of the subject application as a template for the purpose of piecing together various elements of the prior art with the aim of demonstrating the obviousness of the claimed invention.

The claimed invention is directed to a hand-held device that is adapted to display a representation of an electronic document comprising human-readable information in a form for instructing a consumer how to operate a consumer appliance. The electronic document may be downloaded from an appliance or from a Web site. Furthermore, the hand-held device may provide data to the Web site that serves to identify the appliance to the Web site. The Web site may then use the data to select the appropriate electronic document for downloading to the hand-

held device (i.e., the electronic document comprising human-readable information in a form for instructing a consumer how to operate the consumer appliance that corresponds to the provided data). Still further, the provided data may be the same data used to setup a universal remote control (e.g., a remote control device setup code). In this manner, for example, the claimed invention has the advantage of allowing a user to quickly and easily access a user manual for an appliance in cases where a printed user manual supplied with the appliance is otherwise lost.

Unlike the claimed invention, Amro discloses an appliance that has stored in memory a control program 260, a configuration object 290, an interface 270, and drivers 280. The interface 270 includes a plurality of application program interfaces (“APIs”). The configuration object 290 is for providing a graphical user interface on the display of a hand-held device, i.e., the configuration object 290 describes the functions and appearance of the graphical user interface. In this manner, the hand-held device of Amro may download the interface 270 and the configuration object 290 to mimic the graphical user interface of the appliance on the display of the hand-held device whereby the user may interact with the displayed graphical user interface to control operation of the appliance (as if they were interacting with the graphical user interface of the appliance itself) and/or view the status of the appliance. While the appliance of Amro transmits a user interface to the hand-held device of Amro, no human-readable instructions are provided by the appliance to the hand-held device for the purpose of instructing the consumer how to use the graphical user interface to operate the appliance. Rather, the consumer would be required to find a printed user manual (or use trial and error) to discern what the graphical user interface controls are intended to display and/or command. Thus, since the system of Amro suffers the very disadvantages the presently claimed invention seeks to overcome, it is evident that the disclosure in Amro of downloading from the appliance no more than a graphical user

interface fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the specifically claimed providing to the hand-held device an electronic document comprising human-readable information in a form for instructing a consumer how to operate a consumer appliance. For at least this reason it is clear that Amro cannot be said to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claims now presented, as is required to maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, and, as such, the rejection of at least claims 1-6, 11, and 12 must be withdrawn.

Turning now to Huang, Huang discloses a system wherein an electronic program guide is downloadable into a hand-held device. It will be appreciated, however, that, while the downloaded program guide may provide information to a user, it fails to provide information in a form for instructing a consumer how to operate an appliance. Therefore, like Amro, the system of Huang also suffers the very disadvantages the presently claimed invention seeks to overcome. In other words, a user of the Huang hand-held device would still be required to find a printed user manual (or use trial and error) to discern how to operate an appliance (whether by means of the hand-held device displaying the electronic program guide or manually). Furthermore, since the electronic program guide of Huang is appliance generic, it will be appreciated that the Web site of Huang is not (and need not) be provided with data that functions to identify an appliance such that the Web site may retrieve an electronic document comprising human-readable information in a form for instructing a consumer how to operate the consumer appliance that is identified by the provided data. Therefore, for the reason that Huang, either alone or in combination with Amro, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claims now pending, as is required to maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, it is submitted that the rejection of at least claims 7-10 and 13-27 must be withdrawn.

With respect to the rejection of originally filed claims 2 and 18, it is respectfully noted that Kolowa fails to disclose, teach, or suggest an appliance having stored thereon a recipe or transmitting a recipe from the appliance to a hand-held device. Rather, Kolowa discloses a computer that is mounted to a kitchen counter, cupboard, or appliance (such as a refrigerator) where the recipe may be presented to a user on a display of the computer. Accordingly, it is submitted that Kolowa also fails to provide the teachings or suggestions required to modify either Amro or Huang to arrive at the invention claimed.

Similarly, with respect to the rejection of originally filed claim 4, it is respectfully submitted that Morris fails to disclose, teach, or suggest an appliance having stored thereon an electronic document comprising human-readable information in a form for instructing a consumer how to operate the consumer appliance or transmitting such an electronic document to a hand-held device. Rather, Morris discloses no more than a system for using a network to access digital images stored in a digital device such as a digital camera. Accordingly, it is submitted that Morris additionally fails to provide the teachings or suggestions required to modify either Amro or Huang to arrive at the invention claimed.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is in good and proper form for allowance. Such action of the part of the Examiner is respectfully requested. Should it be determined, however, that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the attorney undersigned.

Respectfully Submitted;

Date: September 8, 2003

By: 

Gary R. Jarosik, Reg. No. 35,906
Greenberg Traurig, PC
77 West Wacker Drive, Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 456-8449